

United States Patent and Trademark Office



| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/777,471 | 02/06/2001 | Raul A. Bircann | 89190.157900/DP-303637 | 4278 |
| 75 | 590 01/12/2004 | | EXAMI | NER |
| | Delphi Technologies, Inc. BONDERER, DAVID | | | DAVID A |
| P.O. Box 5052 Mail Code 4804 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Troy, MI 480 | 07 | | 3732 | 17 |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004 | , , |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | SM |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/777,471 | BIRCANN ET AL. | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | D. Austin Bonderer | 3732 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with t | he correspondence address | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS a cause the application to become ABANE | be timely filed) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communicationED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | tion. |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 D | <u>ecember 2003</u> . | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This | action is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E | | | is |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | wn from consideration. | | |
| Application Papers | · | | • |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc | | he Examiner. | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. | See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | • |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | | | · · · |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | kaminer. Note the attached Of | fice Action or form PTO-152. | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | 10(a) (d) as (6) | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti since a specific reference was included in the first 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language pro 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti reference was included in the first sentence of the | s have been received. s have been received in Appl rity documents have been rec u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not rec ic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1 st sentence of the specification povisional application has been ic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ | cation No elived in this National Stage elived. 19(e) (to a provisional application Data Someonic and Application Data Someonic and Application Data Someonic and Application Data Someonic and Application Data Some | heet. |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 5) 🔲 Notice of Inforr | nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152) | .• |

Application/Control Number: 09/777,471

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- 2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Golovatai-Schmidt et

al.

Golovatai discloses a valve comprising:

- Two pole pieces 21, 22;
- An electric core;
- A bearing 12 axially retained in one of the two pole pieces;
- The effective bearing diameter nearly identical as that of the shaft;
- A gap 7;
- An armature 110;
- A shaft 36;
- Gap filled with air 7;
- The armature is frusto-conical; and
- Attachable to a device providing for linear actuation.

Application/Control Number: 09/777,471

Art Unit: 3732

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golovatai.

As mention before the effective inner diameter of Golovatai is nearly identical as the shaft. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to a smaller barring, since it has been held that where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Also the ratio of the baring length to the shaft diameter is considered to be an optimum range decision.

5. Claims 6- 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golovantai in view of Hussy et al.

Golovantai discloses a valve. Husssy teaches the use of an EGR valve in a combustible engine. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the valve design of Golovantai in the EGR Valve of Hussy as it is just intended use. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from the prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 1964 (1987). All the structural limitations of the valve have been met.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cornea et al., Stolk et al., Kather et al., and Frankenberg disclose relevant art to the instant application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Austin Bonderer whose telephone number is 703.306.5911. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P Shaver can be reached on 703.308.2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703.872.9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.308.0873.

dab

PEDRO PHILOGENE PRIMARY EXAMINER